

done. There was a practical difficulty. The answers have been printed at the rate of ten questions per list. So, there is a certain amount of incongruity in the direction I have given. I propose that for the succeeding list it will be only ten questions and thereafter every list will contain twelve questions.

Senates of the Mysore and Karnatak Universities—Names of Members announced.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In connection with the election to the Senates of the Mysore and Karnatak Universities, as the number of candidates is equal to the number of seats to be filled in, the following members are declared elected and consequently there will be no elections in this behalf.

Senate of the Mysore University:—

Sriyuths:—

1. S. M. Krishna
2. G. Madegowda
3. C. J. Muckannappa
4. R. Muniswamiah
5. Smt. Nagarathnamma Hiremath
6. T. R. Parameswaraiah

Senate of the Karnatak University:—

Sriyuths:—

1. Smt. Basavarajeswari
2. C. M. Desai
3. R. A. Koppal
4. Siddaiah Veeraiah Kashimath.

2-00 P.M.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the report of the Resources and Economy Committee.

VOTING OF DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS FOR 1956-57 AND 1957-58

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister for Finance is just smiling and hinting that I am saying something in

regard to the procedure *re*: this excess demand. The Hon'ble Members would have seen that the item in the Agenda is voting of excess Demands and the word used is "voting" and that is rightly so for the reason that this is not a normal demand and that it is not a supplementary demand. A supplementary demand is occasioned when before the financial year is out, it is seen that either a new service is to be started or more money is wanted for a scheme. This is not a supplementary demand. This is an excess amount of expenditure as has already been incurred. There are such contingencies. It does not occur for the first time in this House. It occurs all over and in all Legislatures. When expenditure is incurred, there is the audit report and when the audit report is submitted, it is seen that there are a few items of excess expenditure and that certain reconciliations have not been effected and the report has been submitted. That report is dealt with by the Public Accounts Committee and that Committee goes into the matter thoroughly and a report is given. And, the report of the Public Accounts Committee covering the period in question has already been discussed—the report of 1956-57 and 1957-58—and the debate with regard to the matter is absolutely over. But at the time of discussing the Public Accounts Committee's report, there was no voting. But Members have had the fullest opportunity to Debate on it. This is wanted only for the purposes of voting. The procedure that is normally followed is that it will be directly put to vote. There is no scope for debate for the reason that the debate is already over when the report of the Public Accounts Committee was before the House. That is why the wording in the Agenda is—voting of excess demands.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palya).—Sir, it is not a question of debate. But I am surprised to see that inordinate delay has been caused for regularising this expenditure. It relates to the years 1957-58. And now they are coming before the House to get our approval. Why has this